

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 5 are currently amended. Claims 2 and 8-20 are canceled. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

New matter is not being introduced in the application by way of this amendment. The perfluorocyclopentene amendments to claims 1 and 5 are supported at page 20, lines 16-19 of the present specification. The remaining amendment to claim 1 is editorial and does not change the scope of the claim. Accordingly, no new matter is added and entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Anolick '389 (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,389). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. "MPEP §2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit that each and every element of the present claims is not disclosed by Anolick '389. Anolick '389 fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, a cover film comprising polymers of decomposition products of perfluoroolefins comprising more than 70% by weight of perfluorocyclopentene as presently claimed. Accordingly, applicants

respectfully submit that a case of anticipation has not been made out, and withdrawal of this rejection is required.

Anolick '389 discloses amorphous tetrafluoroethylene-hexafluoropropylene (TFE-HFP) dipolymers, and other copolymers containing TFE, HFP and a third monomer. See Anolick '389, Abstract. Anolick '389, at column 2, lines 43-48, discloses: "an amorphous polymer derived from 27-60 mole percent hexafluoropropylene, up to 5 mole percent total of one or more fourth monomers and the balance tetrafluoroethylene, provided that the polymer contains at least 1 mole percent tetrafluoroethylene, wherein said fourth monomer is perfluorocyclopentene."

However, applicants respectfully submit that Anolick '389 fails to disclose a cover film comprising polymers of decomposition products of perfluoroolefins comprising more than 70% by weight of perfluorocyclopentene as presently claimed. Anolick '389 discloses, at column 6, lines 10-55, examples of monomers which may be incorporated into the amorphous polymer. Perfluorocyclopentene is disclosed as an example of a repeat unit (III) which may be present in an amount ranging from 0.1 to 10 mole percent. See column 6, line 42. Anolick '389, at column 7, lines 44 to 46, states that: "[T]he total amount of "X" which may be in the copolymer may not exceed the highest amount for any of the individual monomers, as given above." In fact, in Example 107 of Anolick '389, a mixture of 2000 g of HFP, 137 g TFE, 20 g perfluorocyclopentene and ~0.6 g of NF_3 is used to prepare a copolymer. The prepared copolymer contained 0.6 mole % of perfluorocyclopentene. See Anolick '389, Example 107, column 44, line 51.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that a cover film comprising polymers of decomposition products of perfluoroolefins comprising more than 70% by weight of

perfluorocyclopentene as recited in the present claim 1 is not disclosed, either expressly or inherently, by Anolick '389. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) over Anolick '389 is therefore required.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3-7 are rejected over 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anolick '389 in view of Nakamura '858 (U.S. Patent No. 5,427,858). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the present claim limitations are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The prior art does not disclose or suggest a cover film comprising polymers of decomposition products of perfluoroolefins comprising more than 70% by weight of perfluorocyclopentene as claimed in the present claim 1. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and this rejection must be withdrawn.

The Examiner mentions in the Office Action that Anolick '389 fails to teach the use of their polymers in organic electroluminescence devices. See page 3, paragraph 9, of the Office Action. Applicants have demonstrated above that Anolick '389 does not teach or suggest a cover film comprising polymers of decomposition products of perfluoroolefins comprising more than 70% by weight of perfluorocyclopentene. The Examiner mentions in the outstanding Office Action that Nakamura '858 only specifically mentions perfluoropropene. See Page 4, line 7 of the Office Action. Therefore all of the present claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is also no suggestion to combine the disclosure of Anolick '389 with Nakamura '858 in the prior art. Furthermore, as shown above, even assuming *arguendo* that the amorphous polymer of Anolick '389 were to be employed in the device of Nakamura '858, one of ordinary skill the art would still not arrive at the device as defined in the present claims 3 to 4 and 6 to 7, and the process of claim 5. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Anolick '389 and Nakamura '858 does not render obvious the present claims 3 to 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is required. An early reconsideration and Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims is respectfully requested.


Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mark Konieczny (Reg. No. 47,715) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raymond C. Stewart

Registration No.: 21,066

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

